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Pattani Malay

- Spoken in the 3 southernmost provinces of Thailand: Pattani, Yala, and Narathiwat

- 1,300,000+ speakers according to the latest census (National Statistical Office 2012a, 2012b 2012c)

- Closely related to Malay dialects of northeastern Peninsular Malaysia, i.e. Kelantan and Terengganu (Uthai 2011)

[Map of Southeast Asia showing Pattani Malay region]
IGs are contrastive for all consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geminates</th>
<th>Singletons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/mmatɔ/ ‘jewelry’</td>
<td>/matɔ/ ‘eye’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/kkatoʔ/ ‘frog’</td>
<td>/katoʔ/ ‘hammer’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ggaʃi/ ‘saw’</td>
<td>/gaʃi/ ‘wage’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PM lacks medial/final geminates, unique linguistic situation
Previous studies reported the following acoustic cues to IGs in PM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Geminates</th>
<th>Singletons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consonant duration</td>
<td>longer x 3</td>
<td>shorter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vowel duration</td>
<td>longer ?</td>
<td>shorter ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vowel F0</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vowel Intensity</td>
<td>higher</td>
<td>lower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abramson (2004) argued that F0 and intensity are becoming increasingly salient perceptually, which may lead to the emergence of a prosodic contrast.
This study

- Naturalistic data from a larger pool of speakers
- Statistical analyses reveal small differences in consonant duration
- LDA classification performs only slightly above chance
- IGs may be only marginally contrastive
Acoustics analyses
Data collection

- 14 speakers (6M; 8F) in age range 20-61 y.o. ($\mu = 33$, $\sigma = 16$)
- Target words: 13 disyllabic minimal pairs x 6 repetitions
- Each target word embedded in two positions: medial & final
- Each sentence cued by a natural sounding corresponding Thai sentence
Eight acoustic measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial segment</th>
<th>Initial syllable</th>
<th>First 10% of following vowel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration (ms)</td>
<td>raw</td>
<td>raw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F0 (semitone)</td>
<td></td>
<td>μ</td>
<td>μ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity (dB)</td>
<td></td>
<td>max</td>
<td>μ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relative measurements:

1. $\mu$ F0 of initial syllable - $\mu$ F0 of final syllable
2. $\mu$ RMS amplitude of initial syllable / $\mu$ RMS amplitude of final syllable
Statistical analyses

- Linear mixed effect regression
- Compare a model where the fixed effect was the presence/absence of IGs to an intercept-only model
- Random effects: subject, word, position of word in a phrase (medial/final)
IGs are significantly longer than singletons (~17 ms)
No difference in **syllable** duration
No difference in $\textbf{F0}$ after IGs/singletons both for the entire vowel or the first 10%
No difference in **intensity** after IGs/singletons both for the entire vowel or the first 10%
No difference in **F0 Δ** or **RMS amplitude ratio** of initial and final syllable
The only (small) difference is **segment duration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial segment</th>
<th>Initial syllable</th>
<th>First 10% of following vowel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration (ms)</td>
<td>✓ (17 ms)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F0 (semitone)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity (dB)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relative measurements:

- ✗ (1) $\mu$ F0 of initial syllable - $\mu$ F0 of final syllable
- ✗ (2) $\mu$ RMS amplitude of initial syllable / $\mu$ RMS amplitude of final syllable
Linear discriminant analysis (LDA)
LDA used to distinguish singleton vs geminates

- Very successful for medial geminates, e.g. in Japanese (~95%)
  (Idemaru & Guion-Anderson 2010, Amano et al. 2019)

- Less successful, but still good for IGs, e.g. in Salentino (~80%)
  (Burroni & Maspong to appear)
Methodology and feature selection

- Data partition: 80% (training) 20% (test)
- 10,000 LDAs (μ and covariance matrices)
- Report μ accuracy and σ of these models in predicting classes
- Features: CDur* and CDur/WordDur* , σDur, σMeanF0, σMaxInt
- All features z-scored
Classification above chance, but poor (~62%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Structure</th>
<th>Mean Accuracy</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDur</td>
<td>62.36%</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDur/WordDur</td>
<td>59.84%</td>
<td>2.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDur + CDur/WordDur + σ_Dur + σ_MaxInt + σ_MeanF0</td>
<td>58.88%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDur + CDur/WordDur + σ_Dur</td>
<td>58.20%</td>
<td>2.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDur + CDur/WordDur + σ_Dur + σ_MeanF0</td>
<td>58.84%</td>
<td>2.18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confusion Matrix:

- True Class 1: Predicted Class 1 - 65.5%
- True Class 1: Predicted Class 2 - 34.5%
- True Class 2: Predicted Class 1 - 37.3%
- True Class 2: Predicted Class 2 - 62.7%
Why is classification of Pattani IGs so low?
Interim Summary

- Classification above chance suggests the existence of a singleton/IG contrast ...
- But low classification accuracy, large overlap, and limited statistical differences show that the contrast is subtle (contra previous descriptions)
- What is happening to the singleton/IG contrast in Pattani Malay?
Discussion
3 Hypotheses

1) Contrast is being neutralized in naturalistic speech
2) Contrast is being neutralized for some speakers
3) Contrast is being neutralized for some minimal pairs
(1) Contrast is neutralized in naturalistic speech (?)

- Previous work on Pattani Malay IGs limited to words in isolation or in carrier sentence == hyper articulated speech
- Perhaps contrast not as robust in naturalistic speech
- We cannot assess this because we do not have lab and naturalistic speech from the same speakers
- Follow-up study planned
(2) Contrast neutralized for some speakers (✗)
(3) Contrast neutralized for some minimal pairs (✓)
Why contrast neutralization for some lexical items?

- Evolutionary Phonology (EP) holds that IGs tend to degeminate
- IGs survive only when they “compete” lexically with singletons,
- When they are the unique cue to word meaning e.g., when they mark a different form of the paradigm
- This is modeled with a random walk without and with exemplar trading

(Blevins & Wedel 2009)
When IGs can be disambiguated from context...

no exemplar trading, merger is possible (random walk)
When IGs *cannot* be disambiguated from context...

Exemplar trading, merger is blocked (random walk with a wall)
Does this work for Pattani Malay?

• Some forms **disambiguated** by (morphosyntactic) context **do merge**...
  
  ○ e.g., [dapo] ‘kitchen’ and [ddapo] ‘at the kitchen’

• ... but forms **not disambiguated** by context **also merge**
  
  ○ e.g., [kabo] ‘Java kapok’ and [kkabo] ‘beetle’

• Lexical competition alone not enough to predict the fate of IGs
  
  (Burroni & Maspong to appear)
What other factors may be responsible for loss of contrast?

- IGs no longer used for morphological derivation (e.g. causative, passive) (Uthai 1993)
- Perhaps IGs have a reduced “functional load” (FL) \( \frac{H(L) - H(L_{xy})}{H(L)} \)
- FL known to correlate with \textbf{C/CC duration} and \textbf{resistance to merger}
- If Pattani Malay corpora were available we could estimate FL
Status of the singleton vs IG contrast in Pattani Malay?

- Contrast currently observed for some minimal pairs only
- **Marginal or quasi-phonemic?**
- Strikingly different from previous reports, but ...
- ...in line with reports that marginal contrasts display large overlaps in naturalistic speech (Cohn & Renwick 2019)
Conclusion
5 takeaways

1) Difference between IGs and singletons is C-duration, LDA classification is not very accurate (~62%)

2) Large distributional overlap, *contra* previous reports, which, however, used different data collection strategies

3) All speakers realized the contrast, but only for some minimal pairs

4) Counterexample to the EP claim that contrast is maintained for minimal pairs that compete morphosyntactically and lexically

5) Information theoretic measurement, like FL, may help us better understand why and how the IG/singleton contrast is changing
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